

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-10 are now present in the application. Claim 10 has been amended. Claims 1 and 8 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons For Entry Of Amendments

As discussed in greater detail hereinafter, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 102 and 103 are improper and should immediately be withdrawn. Accordingly, the finality of the Final Office Action mailed on October 17, 2005 should be withdrawn.

In addition, the amendments to claim 10 merely clarifies what was previously claimed and do not narrow the scope of the claims in any way or change the meaning of the claims so as to require further consideration and or search.

If the Examiner persists in maintaining his rejections, Applicant submits that this Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicant is responding to a new ground of rejection set forth in the Final Office Action. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, Applicant respectfully requests entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments as they remove issues for appeal.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As the Examiner will note, claim 10 has been amended to address the Examiner's requested changes. Accordingly, claim 10 is now definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Diepstraten, U.S. Patent No. 5,339,316. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of steps including "transmitting data and a separate clock signal from a first control unit to a second control unit, at the same time checking a reception confirmation signal of the second control unit by the first control unit" and "transmitting data and a separate clock signal from the second control unit to the first control unit, at the same time checking a reception confirmation signal of the first control unit by the second control unit by checking the separate clock signal from the first control unit". Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of steps set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner alleged that Diepstraten's control/status bus 56 in FIG. 2 discloses the step of checking a reception confirmation signal of the second control unit by the first control unit. Applicant on page 4, lines 3-7 of the last Amendment filed August 5, 2005 had responded to the Examiner's rejection that Diepstraten merely teaches that the control/status bus 56 carries control/status signals (see col. 3, lines 47-48), and *Diepstraten nowhere teaches that the control/status signals include a reception confirmation signal as recited in claim 1*. Therefore, Diepstraten cannot teach that the wireless MAC control unit 46 or the radio modem 62 checks the reception confirmation signal of the control/status bus 56. Therefore, Diepstraten fails to teach "transmitting data and a separate clock signal from a first control unit to a second control unit, at the same time checking a reception confirmation signal of the second control unit by the first control unit" as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner also alleged that Diepstraten's teaching regarding the clock signal TXC 60 teaches the step of "checking a reception confirmation signal of the first control unit by the second control unit by checking the separate clock signal from the first control unit" as recited in claim 1. In particular, the Examiner in the Response to Arguments of the outstanding Office Action alleged "a reception confirmation signal is the same as the separate clock signal from the first control unit", "[s]ince Diepstraten teaches a separate clock signal from the first unit to the second unit, this constitute as a confirmation signal", and "there are only 4 signals in the current application, i.e., TXD RXD, TXC, RXC. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the confirmation signal is equivalent as the TXC signal, and there is no more extra signal has been transmitted or received besides these 4 signals". Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, although Diepstraten discloses that the radio modem 62 (referred to by the Examiner as the second control unit) receives the clock signal TXC 60 from the wireless MAC control unit 46 (referred to by the Examiner as the first control unit), *the term "receiving" is not synonymous with "checking"*. Diepstraten nowhere discloses that the radio modem 62 will check the clock signal TXC 60 from the wireless MAC control unit 46 in order to check a reception confirmation signal of the first control unit. Therefore, Diepstraten fails to teach "checking a reception confirmation signal of the first control unit by the second control unit by checking the separate clock signal from the first control unit" as recited in claim 1.

Second, Diepstraten discloses that the transmit clock line TXC 60 is an associated transmit clock line to the serial transmit data (TXD) signals (see col. 3, lines 48-50). In other words, Diepstraten merely discloses that the transmit clock line TXC 60 is associated with the serial transmit data signals TXD. Diepstraten fails to disclose that the transmit clock line TXC 60 has anything to do with the reception confirmation signal of the wireless MAC control unit. Accordingly, there is no support for the Examiner to construe that the transmit clock line TXC 60 is equivalent to the reception confirmation signal as suggested in his Response to Arguments of the outstanding Office Action.

Third, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion "[a]ccording to FIG. 6, there are only 4 signals in the current application, i.e., TXD RXD, TXC, RXC... *there is no more extra signal* has been transmitted or received besides these 4 signals". In fact, the TXD RXD, TXC and RXC are transmission lines to transmit signals. For example, the specification discloses that the TXC line can transmit a feedback signal (see paragraphs 0034 and 0035), a transmission permission signal (see paragraph 0036), etc. at different time periods. In other words, the TXC

line can transmit *more than one signal*. One can transmit different types of signals via a single signal line. Therefore, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion that the transmit clock line TXC 60 is equivalent to the reception confirmation signal because the Examiner made an incorrect assumption that a single signal line can only transmit one type of signal.

In view of the above, since Diepstraten fails to disclose that the TXC signal 60 has anything to do with the reception confirmation signal of the wireless MAC control unit and that the radio modem 62 will check the clock signal TXC 60 from the wireless MAC control unit 46, Diepstraten fails to teach "checking a reception confirmation signal of the first control unit by the second control unit by checking the separate clock signal from the first control unit" as recited in claim 1.

Since Diepstraten fails to teach each and every recitation of independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Diepstraten.

In addition, claims 2-7, 9 and 10 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In addition, the Examiner also relied on the information packet 70 in FIG. 3 of Diepstraten and the corresponding description to reject dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7. For example, the Examiner alleged that the signals 71 and 72 in FIG. 3 of Diepstraten and the radio modem 62 of FIG. 2 teaches "starting the data transmission with a data transmission start signal, and receiving the reception confirmation signal from the second control unit" and "recognizing the data reception of the second control unit, and reversing the transmission start signal in order to transmit a next data" of claim 2. However, the information packet 70 (71 and 72 are a portion

of 70) is transmitted from a station A1 to a station A2 (see FIGs. 1, 4 and 5), which are separate from the wireless MAC control unit 46 (referred to by the Examiner as the first control unit) and the radio modem 62 (referred to by the Examiner as the second control unit). In other words, the information packet 70 including the sub packets 71 and 72 is transmitted between the stations separate from the wireless MAC control unit 46 and the radio modem 62, and therefore cannot be relied on to teach the communication between the wireless MAC control unit 46 and the radio modem 62.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7, 9 and 10 clearly define the present invention over the reference relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Diepstraten in view of Knoblock, U.S. Patent No. 4,186,379, and further in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 6,650,149. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Independent claim 8 recites a combination of elements including "the data reception confirmation signal being transmitted via the clock signal transmission from one of the two control units to the other of the two control units". Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements set forth in independent claim 8 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner construed that the clock signal in the TXC line 60 as the reception confirmation signal of claim 8. As mentioned, Diepstraten fails to disclose that the clock signal in the TXC line 60 has anything to do with the reception confirmation signal of the wireless MAC control unit, and there is no support for the Examiner to construe that the transmit clock line TXC 60 is equivalent to the reception confirmation signal as suggested in his Response to Arguments of the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, Diepstraten fails to teach “the data reception confirmation signal being transmitted via the clock signal transmission from one of the two control units to the other of the two control units” as recited in claim 8.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on Knoblock and Wong, these references have only been relied on for their teachings related to the pull-up operation unit and the control voltage matching unit. These references also fail to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 8. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Diepstraten.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of independent claim 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8 clearly defines over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

